

10/042,093
ARC919970008US2

REMARKS

Claims 1-71 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

By this Amendment 58-71 are added to original claims 1-57 (e.g., included in U. S. Patent No. 6,112,202 which is the subject of this Reissue Application).

For the Examiner's convenience, Applicant notes that claim 58 (and similarly in claims 70 and 71) differs from claim 58 presented in the Amendment filed herein on April 30, 2009 as follows:

A method of executing a search of pages having content-based links between each other, the method comprising:

identifying an initial set of pages including a first page and a second page which is linked with said first page;

defining initial authoritativeness information for the initial set of pages, comprising:

producing first authoritativeness information about the first page; and

producing second authoritativeness information about the second page

based on the first authoritativeness information about the first page;

~~using the initial authoritativeness information as input authoritativeness information, and iteratively refining said initial set of pages to produce and determining authoritativeness information for said refined set of pages; and producing a final set of pages based on the first and second authoritativeness information for said refined set of pages.~~

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-71 stand rejected as allegedly being based upon a defective reissue declaration. Applicant again notes that a corrected reissue declaration is being prepared and will be submitted when it becomes available.

10/042,093
ARC919970008US2

Claims 1-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 251 as allegedly being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter.

In particular, on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the Application has broadened the original patent by omitting the recitation of: "the steps of: (i) producing first authoritativeness information about a set of information resources pointed to by links in resources of the input set, and (ii) producing second authoritativeness information about a set of information resources having links that point to resources of the input set ... produce a final set of information resources based on the first and second authoritativeness information".

However, Applicant notes that the limitation "(i) producing first authoritativeness information about a set of information resources pointed to by links in resources of the input set, and (ii) producing second authoritativeness information about a set of information resources having links that point to resources of the input set", is not a limitation which was "relied on by applicant in the original application to make the claims allowable over the art" (MPEP 1412.02). Therefore, the limitation cannot be the subject of a recapture rejection.

In addition, claim 58 (and claims 70-71) recites "*producing first authoritativeness information about the first page; and producing second authoritativeness information about the second page based on the first authoritativeness information about the first page*", which is substantially similar to the original claim 1 which recites "(i) producing first authoritativeness information about a set of information resources pointed to by links in resources of the input set, and (ii) producing second authoritativeness information about a set of information resources having links that point to resources of the input set". Indeed, in either case, the term "first authoritativeness information" may be construed to include, for example, authority values, and the term "second authoritativeness information" may be construed to include, for example, hub values (e.g., see Application at Figure 4).

In addition, claims 58 and 70-71 have been amended to recite "*refining said initial set of pages to produce a final set of pages based on the first and second authoritativeness information*". Therefore, even assuming that the phrase "*based on the first and second authoritativeness information*" was "relied on by applicant in the original application to make the claims allowable over the art", Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation is clearly

10/042,093
ARC919970008US2

recited in claims 58 and 70-71.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 58 and 70-71 clearly comply with the Recapture Rule.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

II. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-71, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: December 16, 2009

Phillip E. Miller
Registration No. 46,060

McGinn IP Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 48150